

other cases were victims of nymphomaniacal impulses. There is, it will be obvious, very little in common between these cases and sexual perversion as described by Gock, Servaes, Krüg, Krafft-Ebing, Ulrichs, and others. Dr. Hammond ("Diseases of the Nervous System") has described a case where shoes were the attraction, and Van Buren and Keyes ("Venereal Diseases") a case where a man was impotent except with women dressed in a peculiar style. As might be expected, impulses of this character are very frequent among hebephreniacs.

---

CONDITION OF PATIENTS ON ADMISSION TO ASYLUMS.—Dr. J. A. Campbell (*Lancet*, July 1, 1882) calls attention to the fact that physicians pay too little attention to the physical condition of patients whom they are about to commit to asylums, and gives a series of cases to illustrate the fact that patients are often brought to asylums in a moribund condition. The necessity for a physical examination of the patient prior to admission, is peculiarly urgent in States requiring jury trials of lunatics.

---

MEDICO-LEGAL RELATIONS OF INSANITY.—Dr. Ira Russell (*Boston Medical and Surgical Journal*, December 14, 1882), in a discussion of the relations of insanity to law, states he regards Guiteau as being a case of moral insanity. In contradiction of the dictum passed by the New York State Medical Society at the instigation of the Utica "alienist," Dr. Russell states that the first obvious symptom of insanity may sometimes be some moral obliquity. He unfortunately, however, adopts the erroneous change of character theory, but not to such an enormous extent as many of his colleagues. He admits that many cases of insanity can best be treated at home. He very properly claims that the whole mental condition of the individual must be taken into account in judging of the question of responsibility, and that the fact that a single delusion only is demonstrable does not prove that the patient is responsible for an act apparently disconnected with such delusion.

---

RESPONSIBILITY OF CRIMINAL LUNATICS.—Under this title Dr. S. S. Herrick (*New Orleans Medical Journal*, December, 1882) discusses the relation between the lunatic and society. He is of opinion that Guiteau was justly executed, not as a punishment, but for the protection of society. Guiteau was a lunatic, but the episodes of his trial were such as to lead Dr. Herrick to believe with Folsom (*Boston Medical and Surgical Journal*, May, 1882,) that his escape would have been an encouragement to the criminal class. Dr. Herrick believes that the sentimental cant about the imprisonment of sane men in lunatic asylums has decidedly bad results. The whole article is permeated by a Spartan spirit, and is evidently

modelled on that of Dr. W. A. Hammond (*JOURNAL OF NERVOUS AND MENTAL DISEASE*, January, 1882). The same ideas are expressed in much more decided terms. One point made is, that relatives of insane patients committing crimes should be held responsible, and this is undeniably a good one, but in many States the law, and not relatives, is responsible for the non-incarceration of a lunatic.

GUITEAU'S INSANITY.—Dr. Godding (*Alienist and Neurologist*, October, 1882), in the pleasant style which marks the "Two Hard Cases," details that weird tragedy, the execution of Guiteau, and tells about the desire of the victim to be executed in white robes, from which he was only deterred by the argument that people would regard him as a lunatic.

After an extended review of the testimony and results of autopsy, Dr. Tamassia (*Revista sperimentale di freniatria e di medicina legale*) arrives at the conclusion that Guiteau was a case of primary monomania (primäre Verrucktheit).

Pelman (*Deutsche medicinische Wochenschrift*, No. 37, 1882), after a careful examination of all the literature of the Guiteau case at his disposal, comes to the conclusion that while there is no doubt that Guiteau was a case of marked psychical defect, to bring him under any ordinary clinical form is a matter of some difficulty. At the same time his mental capacity and responsibility were so doubtful that he should never have been executed.

Dr. Denny (*Boston Medical and Surgical Journal*, December 28, 1882), who had approached the question of Guiteau's mental condition from the stand-point of sanity, finally exhausted all arguments in this direction, and has been led by the weight of evidence to believe Guiteau insane. He claims that there was a resemblance between the case of Guiteau and that of Freeman. The way in which both expressed themselves about their sudden conception, and the way in which they struggled against it, were very similar. The deed itself showed insanity.

Dr. J. P. Gray (*American Journal of Insanity*, October, 1882) says concerning Guiteau's death on the scaffold, that it was that of a great criminal, consistent with Guiteau's life. He fiercely arraigns Dr. Hicks for his unchristian conduct in acting as Guiteau's spiritual adviser; says, in effect, that Guiteau should have been gagged on the scaffold before he should have been allowed to read "as his parting message such a compound of reckless blasphemy and senseless puerility." One might be tempted, in the light of the autopsy, to believe that, in Dr. Gray's opinion, "a lie, well stuck to, is as good as the truth." With the memory of Remshaw's attack still fresh, however, it is obvious that since Dr. Gray was unable to recognize the insanity of a chronic lunatic who was in daily association with him, there was a possibility that he might believe that Guiteau was not a lunatic. Dr. Bucknill, afflicted by the phil-Uticaism which has attacked his colleagues of the *Journal of Mental Science* has written a diatribe on the subject of Guiteau which might have been